

# EXHIBIT 75

**From:** Van Duren, Al  
**To:** Westlin, Dave; Rock, John; Hansen, Gary  
**Sent:** 12/8/2010 1:44:41 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Study In the UK

Using two warming modalities is not the most serious flaw with this proposal – The entire study strategy is flawed for some of the reasons I enumerated before in my email on November 27. If you want to get an expert involved, I suggest talking to Stuart Pocock at the Medical Statistics Division at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Dr. Pocock is an world-class expert in trial design, and has responded quickly to my e-mail questions in the past. He can be contacted at <http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/people/pocock.stuart>.

I suggest that we not contact Dr. Sessler over this design – Dr. Hopf's paper notwithstanding, Dr. Sessler has written several papers showing the essential equivalency of electric blanket and forced-air therapies – Dr. Sessler is not the guy we want to argue differences.

Al

Al Van Duren | Arizant Healthcare  
 Director of Clinical Affairs | [avanduren@arizant.com](mailto:avanduren@arizant.com)

10393 West 70<sup>th</sup> Street, Eden Prairie, MN 55344 USA  
 +1.952.947.1247 (office) | +1.952.918.5247 (fax)  
 +1.952.200.2491 (mobile) | <http://www.arizanthealthcare.com>

[avanduren@arizant.eu](mailto:avanduren@arizant.eu) | (Cleveland, OH)

---

**From:** Westlin, Dave  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 07, 2010 4:49 PM  
**To:** Maharaj, Gary; Hansen, Gary; Van Duren, Al; Mann, Christopher; Woodwick-Sides, Teri; Buehler, Bob; Rock, John  
**Subject:** Proposed Study In the UK

I had a conference call with a number 3M people today (here and in the UK) about the proposed study in the UK using multiple products to determine their bundled effect on infection rates. Our goal with the call was to express Arizant's concerns with the study and our desire to not be involved as the study is currently structured. **Our primary concern is that Hot Dog is to be included interchangeably with the Bair Hugger and Bair Paws products.** The study will not identify any distinction about the effectiveness realized by any specific product. The 3M people in the US all agreed that having two products providing the same therapy, which is not being measured, is a poor idea.

After getting into the discussion a few major points were made:

- 3M wants to be involved in the study as they have other products that are the most recognized products in their categories, and their absence would be noticed.
- 3M UK has already committed the 3M and Arizant products to the study (at least informally). It was said that it would be very awkward for us to withdraw at this point.
- Arizant products are the exclusive warming products currently used in the hospitals that will be involved in this first phase of the study.

The group agreed that the best approach would be to discuss this with Professor Tanner, with the suggestion to drop the unproven conductive warming technology from the study. Because of built relationships, it was suggested that this conversation be managed in person by Jo Cobley (3M-UK) and Chris Mann. The goal would be to present a case for using a single warming technology for the study, and that should be the proven, and NICE recommended, forced air warming method. We need to be able to present that information to Professor Tanner and allow she and her colleagues to evaluate it and make their decisions based on facts.

I would like to get as much input as possible describing why using one technology should be selected and why that technology should be forced air warming. I started a list below and would like to get as much additional support as possible. Please provide your thoughts and suggestions. We need to have this done by the end of this week. Thanks.

#### Draft list of suggestions

1. NICE guidelines exclusively recognize and recommend forced air warming for patient warming. Why would a NICE sponsored/commissioned study utilize a technology that is not recognized by NICE?
2. There are no published studies that demonstrate that conductive warming is an effective warming method, especially as it relates to a reduction of infection rates.
3. Use of two warming methods, one of which is unproven, can skew the results in a way that is not able to be measured and will thus be unknown.
4. The forced air warming products are the proven, trusted incumbent product at the pilot study facilities.
5. Could we get support from other recognized investigators (i.e., Sessler?) voicing their opinions about the poor technique of including two technologies that are not measured and/or about the use of forced air warming?